FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MAR 2 6 2008

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION



HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD.; and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,
Plaintiffs,

CASE NO. C 00-20905 RMW

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte

CASE NO. C 05-00334 RMW

VS.

RAMBUS INC.,

Defendant.

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC..

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, NANCY TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION U.S.A.,

18

17

Defendants.

19

20 RAMBUS INC.,

21

Plaintiff,

22

vs.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS, INC.,

24 25

Defendants.

26

27

28

Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

CASE NO. C 06-00244 RMW

We, the jury in the above-entitled actions, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict:

FINDINGS ON ANTITRUST CLAIMS

I. Alleged Violation of the Sherman Act: Monopolization

Questions 1-6 below relate to Manufacturers' claims for unlawful monopolization under the Sherman Act.

1. Do you find that it is more likely than not that any of the following technology markets exist? Please respond for each market.

Technology Markets	Yes	ii <mark>No</mark>
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	X	
c. Data acceleration technology market	X	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	V	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	X	

If you answered "Yes" to any part of 1, please answer question 2; if you answered "No" to all parts of question 1, please continue to **Section III.**

2. With respect to any of the markets for which you answered "Yes" to question 1, do you find it more likely than not that a geographic market comprising the United States of America exists (write N/A if you answered "No" to a market above)?

Technology Markets	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market		
c. Data acceleration technology market	1	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	X	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	X	

3. For each market you have found to exist in your response to questions 1 and 2, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus has monopoly power in that market? (Enter N/A for any market for which you answered "No" to questions 1 or 2)

Technology Market	Monopo	ly Power?
	Yes	Ne
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	X	
c. Data acceleration technology market	X	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	Y	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	X	-

If you answered "Yes" to any part of 3, please answer question 4; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts of question 3, please continue to **Section II.**

4. For each market you have found to exist, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus acquired or maintained its monopoly power through anticompetitive conduct? (Enter N/A for any market for which you answered "No" to questions 1, 2, or 3)

Technology Market	Anticon conduct	apetitive ?
	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market		X
b. Burst length technology market		V
c. Data acceleration technology market		X
d. Clock synchronization technology market		X
e. Precharge technology market		
f. Write latency technology market		1

	1
	If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 4, please answer question 5; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts of question 4, please continue to Section II.
5	5. Do you find that it is more likely than not that Rambus's anticompetitive conduct was a material cause of antitrust injury for any of the following parties:
	7 Yes No
	Hynix
8	Micron
9 10	Nanya
11	If you answered "Yes" to question 5 for any party, please answer question 6: if you
12	answerea "No" for all parties, please continue to Section II.
13	69 Did Rambus proffer any logitimete business C. 1
14	in its monopoly power?
15	
16	
17	6a, please continue to Section II.
18	
19	
20	conduct that resulted in its monopoly power outweighed the procompetitive effect of that conduct?
21	Yes No
22	Please proceed to Section II.
23	
24	II. Violation of the Sherman Act: Attempted Monopolization
25	Questions 7-11 holow valate to Manufacturered alains for attended I
26	Questions 7-11 below relate to Manufacturers' claims for attempted monopolization under the Sherman Act.
27	
28	7. For the market(s) that you found to exist in response to questions 1 and 2 in Section I above, do you find that it is more likely than not that Rambus had a specific intent to achieve
	-3- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

monopoly power in one or more of those markets? [If you answered "No" to any part of question 1 or 2, please mark "N/A" for that market.]

	Specific Int	ent to Monopolize?
Markets	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	Х	
c. Data acceleration technology market	*	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	У.	
e. Precharge technology market	×	
f. Write latency technology market	X	

If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 7, please answer question 8; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts, please continue to Section III.

8. For each market you have found to exist, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus engaged in anticompetitive conduct? [If you answered "No" to any part of question 1, 2, or 7, please mark "N/A" for that market.]

Technology Market	Anticon conduct	npetitive ?
	Yes-	No
a. Latency technology market		X
b. Burst length technology market		X
c. Data acceleration technology market		7
d. Clock synchronization technology market		×
e. Precharge technology market		7
f. Write latency technology market		+

If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 8, please answer question 9; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts, please continue to Section III.

-4-

,		C 1 4 4	and real likelihood?
5	Markets	Yes	
;			Mo a substitution of the s
	a. Latency technology market b. Burst length technology market		
			1
	c. Data acceleration technology market		
·	d. Clock synchronization technology market		
	e. Precharge technology market		
	f. Write latency technology market		
10. mate	Do you find that it is more likely than not the erial cause of antitrust injury for any of the follow	at Rambus's an wing parties?	ction III. ticompetitive conduct v
		at Rambus's an wing parties?	
mate	erial cause of antitrust injury for any of the following the Yes.	at Rambus's an wing parties?	
11	erial cause of antitrust injury for any of the following the second seco	at Rambus's an wing parties?	
mate	erial cause of antitrust injury for any of the follow Yes N Hynix Micron	at Rambus's an wing parties?	
mate	Yes N Hynix Micron Nanya If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for any	ot Rambus's an wing parties?	ticompetitive conduct v
	Yes N Hynix Micron Nanya	ot Rambus's an wing parties?	ticompetitive conduct v
mate	Yes N Hynix Micron Nanya If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for any answered "No" for all parties, please continu	at Rambus's an wing parties? o party, please of the to Section II	inswer question 11; if y
mate	Yes N Hynix Micron Nanya If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for any answered "No" for all parties, please continu	at Rambus's an wing parties? o party, please of the to Section II	inswer question 11; if y
mate	Yes N Hynix Micron Nanya If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for any answered "No" for all parties, please continue. Did Rambus proffer any legitimate business in the series of the follows:	at Rambus's an wing parties? o party, please of the to Section II	inswer question 11; if y
mate	Yes. N Hynix Micron Nanya If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for any answered "No" for all parties, please continuate anticompetitive effect?	party, please of the to Section II	inswer question 11; if y

1	1	
2	2 11b. Do you find that it is more likely than not that the antic	ompetitive effect of Rambus's
3	conduct that resulted in an anticompetitive effect outweighed the conduct?	he procompetitive effect of that
4	4 Yes No	
5		7
6		••
7	7	
8	8	
9	9	
10	10	
11	11	
12	12	
13	13	
14	14	
15	15	
16	16	
17	17	
18	18	
19	19	
20	20	
21	21	
22	22	
23	23	er e
24	24	
25	25	
26	26	
27	27	
28	28	
	-6-	Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1			FINDINGS ON FRAUD CLAIMS
2			
3	III.	Fraud	
4	A.	Intentional Misreprese	ntation: Please answer the following questions as to each
5	Manu	facturer:	
6		Hynix	
7 8			oortant representations that it did not have any intellectual property EC and intend or reasonably expect that the representations would ers including Hynix?
9		Yes	
10		If you answered "Yes"	to question 12, please answer question 13; if you answered "No"
11		please continue to Mic	ron.
12	10	W D l	
13	13.	Were Rambus's repres	entations faise?
14		Yes	_ No
15	-	If you answered "Yes" please continue to Mic	to question 13, please answer question 14; if you answered "No" ron.
16 17	14. the rep		ow that the representations were false when it made them or make and without regard for their truth?
18	*	Yes	No
19			to question 14, please answer question 15; if you answered "No"
20		please continue to Mic	
21	15.	Did Rambus intend for	Hynix to rely on the representations?
22		Yes	No
23			to question 15, please answer question 16; if you answered "No"
24		please continue to Mic	ron.
25	16.	Did Hynix reasonably	rely on Rambus's representations?
26		Yes	No
27		• •	to question 16, please answer question 17; if you answered "No"
28		please continue to Mic	ron.
			G N 00 20005, 05 224, 06 044 PM

1	17.	Was Hynix harn	ned?					
2		·						
3		Yes _		No				
4		If you answered please continue	_	estion 17	, please an	swer qu	estion 18; if you answered "N	∛o″
5	18.	Were Rambus's	representation	ons a sub	stantial fac	tor in ca	nusing Hynix's harm?	
7		Yes		No				
8		Please continue	to Micron					
		rease commune	10 11401014.					
9		Micron						
10	19.	Did Rambus mal	ke important	t represei	ntations tha	t it did 1	not have any intellectual prop	ertv
11	, -	ning to the work o	f JEDEC an	d intend	or reasonal		ct that the representations we	
12	be nea	rd by or repeated	to otners inc	_	4icron?			
13		Yes _		No	<u></u> >			
14			_	stion 19,	, please an	swer que	estion 20 ; if you answered "N	lo"
15		please continue	o ivanya.					
16	20.	Were Rambus's	representation	ons false	?			
17		Yes _		No				
18		If you answered please continue t	-	estion 20 ,	please ans	swer que	estion 21; if you answered "N	lo"
19	21.	Did Rambus eith	er know tha	t the ren	resentations	s were fa	alse when it made them or m	ake
20		presentations reckl						
21		Yes		No				
22		If you answered	"Yes" to que	stion 21,	please ans	wer que	estion 22; if you answered "N	lo"
23		please continue t	o Nanya.					
24	22.	Did Rambus inte	nd for Micro	on to rely	on the rep	resentat	ions?	
25		Yes _	·	No				
26		If you answered	"Yes" to que	stion 22,	please ans	wer que	estion 23 ; if you answered "N	lo"
27		please continue t	o Nanya.					
28	23.	Did Micron reason	onably rely o	on Ramb	us's represe	entations	?	
:					-8-		Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-2	:44 RMW

1		Yes	No			
2		If you answered "Y please continue to .	•	please answe	er question 24; if you answered "No"	
4	24.	Was Micron harme	_			
5		Yes	No			
7		If you answered "Y please continue to	-	please answe	er question 25 ; if you answered "No"	
8	25.	Were Rambus's rep	presentations a subs	stantial factor	in causing Micron's harm?	
10		Yes	No			
11		Please continue to	Nanya.			
12		Nanya				
13 14	1 ^		EDEC and intend	or reasonably	did not have any intellectual property expect that the representations would	
15		Yes	No _	X		
16 17		If you answered "Y please continue to I	-	please answe	er question 27; if you answered "No"	
18	27.	Were Rambus's rep	resentations false?	,		
19		Yes	No			
20 21		If you answered "Ye please continue to S		please answe	er question 28; if you answered "No"	
22	28. the rep	Did Rambus either presentations reckles	_		rere false when it made them or make truth?	
23		Yes	No			
24 25		If you answered "Ye please continue to S	-	please answe	er question 29 ; if you answered "No"	
26	29.	Did Rambus intend	for Nanya to rely	on the represe	entations?	
27		Yes	No			
28		***************************************				
				-9-	Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RM	ſW

	!
1	If you answered "Yes" to question 29, please answer question 30; if you answered "No" please continue to Section III-B.
2	
3	30. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's representations?
4	Yes No
5	Please continue to Section III-B – there are no questions for you to answer regarding harm to Nanya.
6	
7	B. <u>Concealment</u> : Please answer the following questions as to each Manufacturer:
8	Half-truths
9	31. Did Rambus utter half-truths about its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with synchronous DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC by
10	disclosing some facts but failing to disclose other important facts, making the disclosure deceptive?
11	Yes No
12	If you answered "Yes" to question 31, please answer question 32; if you answered "No"
13	please continue to Omissions.
14	32. Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
15	Yes No
16	If you answered "Yes" to question 32, please answer question 33; if you answered "No"
17	please continue to 37.
18	33. Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?
19	
20	Yes No
21	If you answered "Yes" to question 33, please answer question 34; if you answered "No" please continue to 37.
22	34. Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
23	
24	Yes No
25	If you answered "Yes" to question 34 , please answer question 35 ; if you answered "No" please continue to 37 .
26	35. Was Hynix harmed?
27	Yes No
28	
	-10- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1	If you answered "Yes" to question 35, please answer question 36; if you answered "No" please continue to 37.
2	
3	36. Were Rambus's half-truths a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?
4	Yes No
5	Please continue to 37.
6	37. Did Micron not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
7	Yes No
8	If you answered "Yes" to question 37, please answer question 38; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
10 11	38. Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?
12	Yes No
13	If you answered "Yes" to question 38, please answer question 39; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
14	39. Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
15	Yes No
16 17	If you answered "Yes" to question 39, please answer question 40; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
18	40. Was Micron harmed?
19	Yes No
20 21	If you answered "Yes" to question 40, please answer question 41; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
22	41. Were Rambus's half-truths a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?
23	Yes No
24	Please continue to 42.
25	42. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
26	Yes No
27	If you answered "Yes" to question 42, please answer question 43; if you answered "No"
28	please continue to Omissions .
-~	11
	-11- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1	43. Did Rambus intend to deceive Nanya by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or		
2	reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?		
3	Yes No		
4 5	If you answered "Yes" to question 43, please answer question 44; if you answered "No" please continue to Omissions .		
6	44. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?		
7	Yes No		
8	Please continue to Omissions .		
9 10	Omissions		
11	45. Did JEDEC members share a clearly defined expectation that members would disclose relevant knowledge they had about patent applications or the intent to file patent applications on technology being considered for adoption as a JEDEC standard?		
12	Yes No <u>X</u>		
13 14	If you answered "Yes" to question 45 , please answer question 46 ; if you answered "No" please continue to Section III-C .		
15 16 17	property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC that was known only to Rambus and which Hynix could not have reasonably discovered?		
18	Yes No		
19	If you answered "Yes" to question 46 , please answer question 47 ; if you answered "No" please continue to 52 .		
20	47. Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?		
21	Yes No		
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 47, please answer question 48; if you answered "No" please continue to 52.		
24	48. Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?		
25	Yes No		
26 27	If you answered "Yes" to question 48, please answer question 49; if you answered "No" please continue to 52.		
28			
	-12- Case Nos. 00-20905: 05-334: 06-244 RMW		

	11	
1	49.	Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
2		Yes No
3		If you answered "Yes" to question 49, please answer question 50; if you answered "No"
4		please continue to 52.
5	50.	Was Hynix harmed?
6		Yes No
7		If you answered "Yes" to question 50, please answer question 51; if you answered "No" please continue to 52.
8	51.	Were Rambus's omissions a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?
9		Yes No
10		Please continue to 52.
11	52.	Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of
12	produ from	cts compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Hynix discovering the fact?
13		Yes No
14 15		If you answered "Yes" to question 52, please answer question 53; if you answered "No" please continue to 58.
16	53.	Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
17		Yes No
18		If you answered "Yes" to question 53, please answer question 54; if you answered "No"
19		please continue to 58.
20	54. reason	Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or nably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?
21		Yes No
22		If you answered "Yes" to question 54, please answer question 55; if you answered "No"
23		please continue to 58.
24	55.	Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
25		Yes No
26		If you answered "Yes" to question 55, please answer question 56; if you answered "No"
27		please continue to 58.
28	56.	Was Hynix harmed?
		-13- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

	H			
1		Yes	No	
2			to question 56, please answer question 57; if you answered	<i>1137 11</i>
3		please continue to 5	to question 30, piease answer question 37; if you answered	"No"
4	57.	Was Rambus's conc	alment a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?	
5		Yes	No	
6		Please continue to 5		
7	58.	Did Rambus intentio	ally fail to disclose an important fact concerning its intellectu	ıal
8 9	property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC that was known only to Rambus and which Micron could not have reasonably discovered?			being
10		Yes	No	
11		If you answered "Ye please continue to 6	to question 58, please answer question 59; if you answered '	'No"
12	59.	Did Micron not know	of the concealed or omitted fact?	
13		Yes	No	
14		If you answered "Yes	to question 59, please answer question 60; if you answered "	'No"
15		please continue to 6	- **	
16 17	60. Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?			
18		Yes	No	
19		If you answered "Yes please continue to 6 4	to question 60 , please answer question 61 ; if you answered ".	No"
20	61.	Did Micron reasonat	rely on Rambus's concealment?	
21		Yes	No	
22		If you answered "Yes	to question 61, please answer question 62; if you answered "I	No"
23		please continue to 64	1 1,7,3,7,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,	.,,0
24	62.	Was Micron harmed		No. of the second
25	İ	Yes	No	
26		If you answered "Yes please continue to 64	to question 62 , please answer question 63 ; if you answered "I	No"
27	63.		ons a substantial factor in cousing Misses 2-1	
28		Word Ramous s Offis	ons a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?	
			-14- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-3	244 RMW

1		Yes No
2	: :	
3		Please continue to 64.
4	64. production d	Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of cts compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Micron liscovering the fact?
5		Yes No
6		If you answered "Yes" to question 64, please answer question 65; if you answered "No"
7		please continue to 70.
8	65.	Did Micron not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
9		Yes No
10		If you answered "Yes" to question 65, please answer question 66; if you answered "No"
11		please continue to 70.
12	66.	Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or ably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?
13	Teason	
14		Yes No
15		If you answered "Yes" to question 66, please answer question 67; if you answered "No" please continue to 70.
16	67.	Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
17		Yes No
18		If you answered "Yes" to question 67, please answer question 68; if you answered "No"
19		please continue to 70.
20	68.	Was Micron harmed?
21		Yes No
22		If you answered "Yes" to question 68, please answer question 69; if you answered "No"
23		please continue to 70.
24	69.	Was Rambus's concealment a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?
25		Yes No
26		Please continue to 70.
27	70.	Did Rambus intentionally fail to disclose an important fact concerning its intellectual
28	conside	y coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being red by JEDEC that was known only to Rambus and which Nanya could not have bly discovered?
		-15- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMV
		15 0000 1100: 00 40705: 05-334. UU-244 KIVI

	Yes No		
3	If you answered "Yes" to question 70, please answer question 71: if you answered "No"		
4	71. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?		
5	Yes No		
7	If you answered "Yes" to question 71, please answer question 72; if you answered "No"		
8	reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?		
9 10	Yes No		
11	If you answered "Yes" to question 72, please answer question 73; if you answered "No" please continue to 74.		
12	73. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?		
13	Yes No		
14	Please continue to 74.		
15	74. Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of		
16	products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Nanya from discovering the fact?		
17	Yes No		
18 19	If you answered "Yes" to question 74, please answer question 75; if you answered "No" please continue to Section III-C .		
20	75. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?		
21	Yes No		
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 75, please answer question 76; if you answered "No"		
23	please continue to Section III-C.		
24	76. Did Rambus intend to deceive Nanya by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?		
25	Yes No		
26	If you answered "Yes" to question 76, please answer question 77; if you answered "No"		
27	please continue to Section III-C.		
28	77. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?		
	-16- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW		

-17-

Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case 5:05-cv-00334-RMW Document 1651 Filed 03/26/08 Page 18 of 18